

Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/724,958	BUFKIN, WILLIAM J.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Joseph F. Edell	3636	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Joseph F. Edell. (3) _____

(2) John Horton. (4) _____

Date of Interview: 16 November 2007.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☐ No.
If Yes, brief description: _____

Claim(s) discussed: 1, 10, 11 and 20.

Identification of prior art discussed: USPN 6,347,771 B1 to Lauzon et al.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☒ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Discussed status of independent claims 1 and 20 following the BPAI decision affirming Examiner Final Rejection in-part. Discussed dependent claim 11 as being previously indicated as allowable if rewritten in independent form. It was agreed that the limitations of dependent claim 11 and intervening dependent claim 10 would be incorporated in independent claims 1 and 20 to render the application allowable. While BPAI reversed Examiner's previous rejections of dependent claim 2 and independent claim 20 that each recites, in pertinent part, the table is separated from the arm rest cover by a vertical offset, Examiner noted that Lauzon et al. appears to teach this limitation.